

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

In re CHRISTINE C., a Person Coming
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHRISTINE C.,

Defendant and Appellant.

G048310

(Super. Ct. No. DL043918)

O P I N I O N

Appeal from an order of the Superior Court of Orange County, Gregory W.
Jones, Judge. Affirmed.

David R. Greifinger, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

* * *

The trial court declared Christine C. (minor) a ward of the court under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition and placed her on formal supervised probation. One of the probation terms included a requirement that she not “associate with Jashua Christopher [a 39-year-old felon with whom she had recent had sexual relations] nor have any person to person contact whatsoever including written, electronic or [third] party communication” with him. A few months later, minor was charged with violating her probation terms, including having contact with Christopher on three dates. Upon sustaining that allegation, the court ordered minor continued as a ward of the court and that she be committed to juvenile hall or another appropriate facility for 60 days with credit for 26 days served.

We appointed counsel to represent minor on appeal. Counsel did not argue against minor, but advised the court he was unable to find an issue to argue on minor’s behalf. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 [87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493], counsel suggested one potentially arguable issue to assist us in our independent review of the record: “Was the court’s finding that minor violated her terms of probation supported by substantial evidence.” We conclude it was. Among other things, deputies at the jail where Christopher was being held intercepted a letter from minor asking Christopher to call her at a specified number. The number was for a cell phone that minor’s mother had turned over to minor’s probation officer. The jail’s phone logs revealed Christopher had made three recorded calls to the number. An investigator listened to the recordings of the calls, which lasted about 44, 30, and 38 minutes respectively, and heard Christopher and minor talking. This evidence was sufficient to support the juvenile court’s finding. (*People v. Superior Court (Jones)* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 667, 681.)

On August 19, 2013, this court provided the minor with 30 days to file written argument on her own behalf. That period of time has passed, and we have

received no communication from her. We have examined the record and found no other arguable issues. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.)

The order is affirmed.

RYLAARSDAM, ACTING P. J.

WE CONCUR:

MOORE, J.

THOMPSON, J.